## <u>REMARKS</u>

Restriction has been required to limit the invention to the Figures of one of what the Examiner has determined to be the following species:

Species I:

Fig. 1 (directed to a fixed conduit)

Species II:

Figs. 2 - 4 (directed to segmented liquid conduit with a hinge 16)

The Examiner is of the opinion that the species, as grouped, are distinct and patently distinct from each other. It is submitted that since Claim 1 is admitted to be generic, and further since there is no claim restriction, all claims should continue in this case for examination. This suggests that the restriction requirement itself is improper, and should be withdrawn.

In order to be fully responsive to the Official Action, Applicant elects to retain the embodiments of Species I for further prosecution in the subject case. But Applicant reserves the right to file one or more divisional applications or to take other appropriate action to protect the embodiments lying within Species II.

In view of the foregoing election and these remarks, withdrawal of the restriction requirement is requested.

6

Further, an action on the merits of the subject application is now believed to be in order, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph H. Dougherty Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 25,851

DOUGHERTY | CLEMENTS

Suite 300

1901 Roxborough Road

Charlotte, North Carolina 28211

Telephone: 704/366-5542

Attorney's Docket 3852